

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated November 5, 2007. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-16, 21, 23-27, 32, 35-37, 39, 41, 43, 45-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-16, 21, 23-27, 32, 34-49 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 21, 23, 24, 27, 32, 36, 37, 41, and 45-49 have been changed, claims 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 have been cancelled, and claims 50-52 have been added by this amendment.

Applicant held a telephone interview with the Examiner on February 6, 2008, the summary of which is provided by the Examiner.

The amendments and new claims are supported by the specification. Claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended to recite that the key combination being received after the particular function to which the hot key is to be mapped has been indicated, as described, for example, at page 9, lines 14-21. Claims 2, 13, and 24 recite accounting for ambiguities in the receiving of the key combination such that the mapping of the particular function to the hot key is not confused with accessing a function previously mapped to the hot key, as described, for example, at page 10, lines 9-19. Claims 6, 16, and 27 recite that the indication of the particular function using the pointing device over the displayed item does not cause the particular function to be performed, as described, for example, at page 8, lines 1-13, page 9, lines 14-16, and page 7, lines 10-11. Claims 10, 21, 32, and 36 recite that the indication of the particular function for mapping does not include clicking the pointing device on the displayed item, and wherein the selection of the displayed item to perform the particular function includes clicking the pointing device on the displayed item, as taught, for example, at page 8, lines 1-13; page 9, lines 14-16; page 7, lines 10-11; and page 5, lines 19-23. Claims 37, 41, and 45-48 recite selecting a portion of the text of the corresponding item, the portion of text being less than the entire displayed text of the displayed item (or one letter of the text), as taught, for example, at page 11, lines

20-23, and page 12, lines 1-2. New claims 50-52 recite that the indication of the particular function is provided by an action of the pointing device different than an action of the pointing device providing the selection of the displayed item to perform the particular function, as taught, for example, on page 8, lines 1-13; page 9, lines 14-16; page 7, lines 10-11; and page 5, lines 19-23. Other dependent claims are amended to conform to amendments in their respective parent claims.

All changes are therefore fully supported by Applicant's specification.

### 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 12-16, 23-27, 34, 35, 37-39, 41-43 and 45-49 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slaunwhite et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US20030090471) ("Slaunwhite"). Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention.

Claim 1 recites a method including integrating a hot key function into a GUI such that it can be accessed within a context and without leaving a context, where the context includes a displayed item displayed in the GUI corresponding to the particular function, and the particular function is performed when the displayed item is selected by the pointing device. Mapping the hot key to the function includes receiving an indication of the function to which the hot key is to be mapped, provided by the user moving the pointing device over the displayed item to indicate the particular function corresponding to the displayed item for mapping. A key combination is received as the hot key in response to the user selecting the key combination using a hardware input device. Applicant has clarified the claim by that the key combination is received after the indication of the particular function to which the hot key is to be mapped has been received.

Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest these features. Slaunwhite discloses that, when assigning a hot key to a function of the computer system, an item receiver 102 receives the item

type from the user input unit 10 and receives an identification of a shortcut key from the user input unit 10 (para. [0036]). The user input unit 10 typically includes a keyboard and a mouse (para. [0027]). Slaunwhite teaches only one way for the item receiver 102 to receive the item type from the user input unit 10, in paragraph [0037]: a customization dialog where the user selects the item type from a list of available item types. Thus Slaunwhite teaches the standard way of mapping hot keys, where a separate list or menu of functions is displayed and the user selects a function in the list to which to assign a hot key.

Slaunwhite is silent to Applicant's claimed feature of a particular function is performed when a corresponding displayed item is selected by the pointing device, and the particular function is indicated for mapping when the pointing device is moved over that same displayed item. The items displayed in Slaunwhite's mapping customization dialog are nowhere taught to be selectable to perform a corresponding function; they are provided as a list of items, each item describing a function which can be assigned to a keyed-in shortcut key if the item is selected. The displayed windows and boxes of Slaunwhite such as the zoom drop down listbox 200 perform functions, but these same displayed items do not provide a dual ability allowing a user to both perform the corresponding function by selecting that item as well as indicate functions for mapping to a received hot key using a pointing device over the item, as claimed by Applicant.

Slaunwhite's only specific example of indicating a particular function for mapping by using a pointing device is in para. [0037], which is selecting an item type in the list displayed in the customization dialog. The items in this list are nowhere disclosed to be also selectable to perform a function. The standard method to allow hot key mapping is to select a function from a list of functions and input a hot key to assign to that selected function, as indicated in Applicant's specification page 2, and this is what Slaunwhite teaches. The function types listed in such a list

do not perform their function when selected—these items are presented for the sole purpose of assigning their function to a hot key, and not as a way to perform the function they represent. Therefore, it would not be obvious to use a displayed item that can be both selected with a pointing device to perform a corresponding function, and also indicated with the pointing device to indicate the corresponding function for mapping to a received hot key.

The Examiner stated that paragraph [0036] teaches a user using a pointing device to select an item type (function for mapping). However, as stated above, paragraph [0036] only states that the item receiver 102 “receives” the item type from the user input unit 10. Nowhere does Slaunwhite teach that the user is selecting a displayed function-performing item, such as a zoom GUI item, a button on a tool bar, or a slider control, to provide that item type to the item receiver 102 for mapping to a hot key. This “receiving” of an item type in Slaunwhite clearly is meant as the selection of an item type from the customization dialog of paragraph [0037]. The Examiner also stated that Figs. 4 and 5 show a zoom GUI item in a top toolbar that would enable a user to perform the particular function when the item is selected. However, nowhere is this zoom GUI item described as also allowing a user to indicate its function for mapping to a received shortcut key when a pointing device is moved over it, as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant’s invention provides an advantage of mapping a hot key to a particular function by interacting a pointing device with the same displayed item that can be selected to perform that function. The user thus does not have to leave the context in which he is providing input, allowing an easy-to-use interface for a user. Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest any such ability, and Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is patentable over Slaunwhite.

Claims 2-4, 6, 10, 34-37, 46, and 49-50 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable over

Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and for additional reasons.

For example, claim 2 recites accounting for ambiguities in the receiving of the key combination such that the mapping of the particular function to the hot key is not confused with accessing a function previously mapped to the hot key. Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest accounting for such ambiguities.

Claim 6 recites that the indication of the particular function using the pointing device over the displayed item does not cause the particular function to be performed. This shows that the indication of an item for mapping its function to a received hot key is not the same as selecting an item for performing its function. For example, a hovering action as disclosed in Applicant's specification is for indicating a function for mapping to a hot key, not performing the function. Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest a displayed item that can be both selected with a pointing device to perform a corresponding function, and also indicated with the pointing device to indicate the corresponding function for hot key mapping, where the indication of the particular function does not cause the function to be performed. For example, Slaunwhite's zoom GUI item described above does not allow a user to indicate its function for shortcut key mapping when a pointing device is moved over it, where such an indication does not cause the function of the zoom GUI window to be performed, as claimed by Applicant.

Claim 35 recites receiving the indication of the particular function for mapping without the user providing input to a menu separate from the context. The Examiner stated that paragraph [0036] does not teach a menu. However, at paragraph [0037] Slaunwhite does teach a menu (the list of item types in a customization dialog), and this menu is Slaunwhite's only specific description for indicating a function for mapping. Claim 49, now dependent on claim 35, recites that the context is a particular context, and wherein the application program has a plurality of different

contexts which can each independently receive user input.

Claim 37 recites that the displayed item is a text-based item including text, and the indication of the particular function includes selecting a portion of the text of the corresponding item, the portion of the text being less than the entire displayed text of the displayed item. Claim 46 recites that indicating the function for mapping includes clicking on one or more letters of the text of the corresponding displayed item with the pointing device, wherein a key of the hardware input device matching the one letter of the text is assigned as a portion of the hot key. These features are not disclosed or suggested by Slaunwhite. For example, Slaunwhite's paragraphs [0040], [0040], [0005], and [0055], cited by the Examiner, mention that the shortcut key Alt-S is assigned to the "Send To" popup menu, but not how that assignment was performed. Slaunwhite mentions nothing about mapping a function indicated by selecting a portion of text (less than the entire text), or one letter of the text, of an item with a pointing device. Nor does Slaunwhite disclose or suggest assigning a key of the input device that matches the clicked-on one letter as a portion of the hot key (as recited in claim 46).

New claim 50 recites that the indication of the particular function to which the hot key is to be mapped is provided by an action of the pointing device different than an action of the pointing device providing the selection of the particular function. For example, a hovering action over an item to indicate its function for mapping, as disclosed in Applicant's specification, is one example of an action that is different than the standard clicking action performed on GUI display items such as buttons, menu items, etc. to perform the functions of those items. Slaunwhite does not disclose or suggest different actions of the pointing device on the same displayed item, one action to perform the particular function, and the other action to indicate the particular function to be mapped to the hot key.

Claims 12 and 23 recite a computer-readable storage medium and computer system including features similar to those of claim 1, and is thus patentable over Slaunwhite for at least similar reasons as claim 1. The claims dependent on claims 12 and 23 are patentable over Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims, and for additional reasons similar to those explained above for dependent claims 2-4, 6, 10, 34-37, 46, and 49-50.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 6, 12-16, 23-27, 34, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 45-52 are patentable over Slaunwhite, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

### 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 21, 32, 36, 40, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaunwhite. These claims are dependent on claims 1, 12, and 23, which are patentable over Slaunwhite as explained above. Claims 40 and 44 have been cancelled. Claims 10, 21, 32, 36 are thus patentable over Slaunwhite for at least the same reasons, and for additional reasons.

For example, these claims recite that indicating the particular function includes the user hovering the pointing device over the displayed item (or a portion thereof) for a predetermined amount of time, and the indication of the particular function for mapping does not include clicking the pointing device on the displayed item, and wherein the selection of the displayed item to perform the particular function includes clicking on the displayed item. For example, the selection to perform the item's function can be the standard clicking action on a displayed item to perform a function, as is well known. Applicant's recited use of the pointing device in selection

of a displayed item to perform a function, that is different from the use of hovering the pointing device over the same displayed item to map its function to a received hotkey, is not disclosed or suggested by Slaunwhite.

The Examiner stated that it was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that selection by dwelling or hovering is an obvious variation of selection by clicking, that Slaunwhite teaches selection by click of the item type, and that it would have been obvious to have included selection by dwelling with the system of Slaunwhite. However, although selection by dwelling or hovering may be known to select a displayed item, such selection is the same as or redundant to selection by clicking, i.e., hovering is known as simply a different way to select items, having the same function and effect as clicking. It is not known or obvious to use selection by clicking for standard selection to perform a function, and selection by hovering over that same displayed item for a different function, i.e., to indicate the item's function for mapping to a received hot key, where that indication does not include clicking the pointing device on the displayed item used for performing the function, as recited in claims 10, 21, 32, and 36.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant submits that claims 10, 21, 32, and 36 are patentable over Slaunwhite, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

#### New Claims

New claims 50-52 have been added by this amendment, which are discussed above under the 102 rejection.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number



indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

February 7, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.  
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 30,801  
(650) 493-4540